

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application.

In the Office Action mailed November 28, 2006, the Examiner rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,205,193 by Solve, et al (hereinafter "Solve"). Applicants respectfully respond to this Office Action.

Rejections of claims 1, 4 and 18 respectfully traversed

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1, 4, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Solve.

Claim 1 recites "a processor for selecting the subset of the second list of cells, the second list of cells comprising the remaining cells from the ranked list of monitored cells not selected in the first list of cells, and the selected subset varying during each cycle." According to the Examiner, Solve discloses "the second list of cells comprising the remaining cells from the ranked list of monitored cells not selected in the first list of cells" in col 14 line 61 through col. 15 line 5, and "the selected subset varying during each cycle" in col. 13 lines 36-40. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the cited passages from Solve.

Col. 14 line 61 through col. 15 line 5 in Solve describes a particular search algorithm, also illustrated in Fig 9 (see Solve: col. 14, lines 20-24). The disclosed algorithm prescribes searching a number of subsets of candidate carriers in sequence, where the subsets include a "best list" and a "neighbor list." At block 330 of Fig 9, a search is performed on a "best list" of candidate carriers (Solve: col. 14, lines 58-59). At block 332 of Fig 9, a "short search" is performed, wherein the "short search" refers to searches conducted on either the best list or the neighbor list, or the best and neighbor list in combination. (Solve: col. 14, lines 25-27; Solve: col. 13, lines 42-51) Col. 14 line 61 through col. 15 line 5 of Solve goes on to prescribe further searches on the "best list" at blocks 334 and 338, and a further "short search" at block 336.

According to Solve, the best list may contain 3 candidate carriers, and the neighbor list up to an additional 12 candidate carriers. (Solve: col. 13, lines 34-37) The section of

Solve cited by the Examiner, col. 13 lines 36-40, states that “these parameters [the sizes of the best list and neighbor list] may be selected in different embodiments and set to different values as they may affect the statistically projected search time involved in the overall synchronization operations as will be discussed subsequently herein.” While the cited section of Solve discloses varying the sizes of the best and neighbor lists depending on “different embodiments,” it does not disclose varying the selected subset of monitored cells “during each cycle,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the cited sections of Solve do not anticipate claim 1.

As claims 2 and 3 depend on claim 1, they are also allowable for at least the reason given above.

As independent claims 4 and 18 incorporate similar limitations, and claims 5-17 depend on claim 4, they are also allowable for at least the reason given above.

Rejections of claims 2 and 5 respectfully traversed

The Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 5 as being anticipated by Solve, col. 13 lines 25-40. Claim 2 recites “the processor further compares the number of cells in the list of monitored cells to a pre-determined search number...” As described above, the cited section of Solve refers to the preferred sizes of the best and neighbor lists. The section does not mention comparing the number of cells in the list of monitored cells to a pre-determined search number, as recited by claim 2. Therefore, Solve does not anticipate claim 2. As claim 3 depends on claim 2, it is allowable for at least the reason given above.

As claim 5 incorporates a similar limitation, it is allowable for at least the reason given above.

Rejections of claims 3 and 6 respectfully traversed

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 6 as being anticipated by Solve, col. 13 lines 25-40. Claim 3 recites “the processor directs the searcher to search each cell in the list of monitored cells when the number of cells in the monitored list is less than or equal to the pre-determined search number.” As described above, the cited section of Solve refers to the preferred sizes of the best and neighbor lists. The section does not mention the processor directing the searcher to search each cell when the number of cells in the monitored list is

less than or equal to the pre-determined search number, as recited by claim 3. Therefore, Solve does not anticipate claim 3.

As claim 6 incorporates a similar limitation, it is allowable for at least the reason given above.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and remarks contained herein, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/28/07

By: /George C. Pappas/
George C. Pappas, Reg. No. 35,065
858-651-1306

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502